

General Disclaimer

One or more of the Following Statements may affect this Document

- This document has been reproduced from the best copy furnished by the organizational source. It is being released in the interest of making available as much information as possible.
- This document may contain data, which exceeds the sheet parameters. It was furnished in this condition by the organizational source and is the best copy available.
- This document may contain tone-on-tone or color graphs, charts and/or pictures, which have been reproduced in black and white.
- This document is paginated as submitted by the original source.
- Portions of this document are not fully legible due to the historical nature of some of the material. However, it is the best reproduction available from the original submission.



ESSL-76-18

(NASA-TM-79443) TRAN*STAR 2 EVALUATION FOR
NOAA DATA BUOY OFFICE, PART A Final Report
(NASA) 8 p HC A02/MF A01 CSCL 17G

N78-22070

Unclas

G3/04 17362

FINAL REPORT

TRAN*STAR II EVALUATION
FOR
NOAA DATA BUOY OFFICE

AUGUST 1976



National Aeronautics and Space Administration

National Space Technology Laboratories

Engineering and Science Services Laboratory

TRAN*STAR II EVALUATION
FOR
NOAA DATA BUOY OFFICE

FINAL REPORT

AUGUST 1976

*via Ken Thoenes
Naval Research Laboratory
user 996
767-3425*

Prepared
by

National Space Technology Laboratories
Engineering and Science Services Laboratory
Bay St. Louis, Mississippi 39520

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Paragraph</u>		<u>Page</u>
PART A - SUMMARY		
1.0	OBJECTIVES	1
2.0	SUMMARY	1
3.0	CONCLUSIONS	3
PART B - TECHNICAL DISCUSSION		
1.0	TRAN*STAR II SYSTEM DESCRIPTION	5
1.1	General	5
1.2	Receiver	6
1.3	Control/Display Unit	7
1.4	Computer Program	7
1.5	Satellite Data	8
2.0	TEST PLANNING	8
3.0	EVALUATION ACTIVITIES	12
4.0	POSITION PERFORMANCE RESULTS	13
4.1	May Test Data	13
4.2	June Test Data	27
4.3	Receiver Performance	32
4.4	Navigation Computer Program	32
5.0	ANALYSIS OF TEST RESULTS	41
5.1	Time Delay Error	41
5.2	Orbital Parameter Errors	43
5.3	Doppler Test Data Incorrect	46
5.4	Dopplers Not Ascending	46
5.5	Dopplers Exist But Satellite Has Set	46
5.6	Fix Obtained But Position Error Greater Than 6 km	47
5.7	Position Fixes From Various Satellites	47
5.8	Position Fix vs Pass Direction	48
5.9	Timing Errors	49
6.0	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS	49
6.1	Positioning Accuracy	49
6.2	Equipment Reliability	50
6.3	Mean Time Between Fixes	51

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

<u>Paragraph</u>	<u>Page</u>
6.4 System Status	51
7.0 REFERENCES	52
8.0 APPENDICES	52

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Number</u>		
1	Fixed Orbital Parameters	9

LIST OF FIGURES

1	Block Diagram of Equipment and Interconnections	10
2	Data Acquisition and Reduction Flow	11
3	Summary of Test Data May 1976	14
4	Summary of Position Fixes May 1976	18
5	May Position Fixes 1976	22
6	Initial Estimates Inputs	23
7	Differences in Position Fix Data Utilizing Varying Initial Positions and Actual Receiver Location May Data	24
8	Summary of Test Data June 1976	28
9	Summary of Position Fixes June 1976	33
10	June Position Fixes 1976	36
11	Differences in Position Fix Data Utilizing Varying initial Positions and Actual Receiver Location June Data	37
12	Histograms of Deviation of Longitude and Latitude Fixes May 1976 (62 Samples)	42
13	June Test Data	44
14	May Test Data	45

PART A - SUMMARY

1.0 OBJECTIVES

The overall objective of the effort conducted as a part of TWR DB2613 is to evaluate the capability of the TRAN*STAR II receiver equipment utilizing the U.S. Navy Navigational Satellite System to provide reliable position locations with reasonable accuracy and frequency.

To satisfy this objective an evaluation plan was prepared (See Appendix A), two receivers, an antenna and a test set were procured, and position fix data collected at NSTL from a fixed known location during the months of May and June. The data was then processed through a computer program, analyzed and a report prepared.

2.0 SUMMARY

The results of the evaluation are summarized below:

1. No known TRAN*STAR II equipment failures were observed during the evaluation period.
2. Position fixes were obtained on a two shift 5 day week basis during May and June. During May 91 position fixes were obtained utilizing receiver number 7 and 62 of these fixes had an error of no more than 6 km*. During June 93 position fixes were obtained utilizing receiver number 5 and 70 of these fixes had an error of no more than 6 km. The mean time between fixes was approximately 3.5 hours in May and 3.0 hours in June. The mean time between good fixes was approximately 5.2 hours in May and 4 hours in June. Eighty percent of the fixes during May and June were from 3 of the 6 navigational satellites (30120, 30140 and 30190).
3. The reasons for not obtaining accurate fixes as determined by the computer program and analysis of the data were as follows:

<u>No.</u>	<u>Reasons</u>
11	Position fix error greater than 6 km
12	Doppler error between theoretical and actual greater than 50,000 Doppler counts.

* 6 km value based on Chauvenet's criterion (Appendix A, Section 7-7).

12	No satellite above the horizon at one minute after lock-on.
6	Satellite lost lock and/or set.
3	No fix obtained
2	Teletype errors of orbital parameters
2	Less than 3 good Dopplers obtained
1	Residuals > 2000 meters
1	Doppler test data incorrect
1	Doppler not ascending
1	No time word in the data
Total	<u>52</u>

Additional analysis was conducted to evaluate these reasons in more detail.

- o Ten of the eleven fixes that had errors greater than 6 km were taken on satellite passes that had a maximum elevation angle greater than 63 degrees.
- o The overflow of the time buffer in the test equipment after 17 hours 4 minutes resulted in timing errors for the first fix taken after each of the 9 weekends of the test.
- o The computer subroutine MATCH rejected good Doppler data in at least three instances due to its logic not being able to handle all test cases.
- o Teletype errors were discovered on the orbital parameter hard copy printout and resulted in no fixes being obtained in two known instances.
- o Test data was manually shifted out of the test set and the nine 8 character words on the LED* display read and recorded sequentially by the data technicians one word at a time as described in the test plan. Several errors in the data were observed that were probably due to human mistakes.
- o In two instances, less than 3 valid Dopplers were received for a fix.

4. The measured latitude and longitude of the test receiver site were:

Latitude	30 ⁰ 21.99'
Longitude	-89 ⁰ 36.98'

*Light Emitting Diode.

The positioning performance of the May and June tests with respect to the estimated position were as follows:

Month	MAY	JUNE
Receiver Number	7	5
Number of Fixes	62	70
Latitude Bias (km)	-0.054 (South)	-0.54 (South)
Longitude Bias (km)	-0.027 (West)	0.18 (East)
Radial Bias (km)	0.06 (200 ft)	0.57 (1870 ft)
Latitude Std Dev (km)	1.94	1.69
Longitude Std Dev (km)	2.21	2.15
Radial Std Dev (km)	2.9	2.7

5. The position fix data was processed utilizing 40 different random initial position estimates that were all within a 230 km distance of the estimated position. The results were similar. The computer program required an average of 3.6 iterations instead of the 2.8 averaged utilizing the known position.
6. It was determined that the fiducial time delay of 75 milliseconds caused by equipment filtering was too short. This time delay which is a constant in the computer program was increased to minimize this error and the standard deviation was reduced as follows:

	MAY	JUNE
Fiducial time delay (msec)	369	333
Latitude Std Dev (km)	.90	.73
Longitude Std Dev (km)	2.11	2.08
Radial Std Dev (km)	2.29	2.21

3.0 CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are drawn from the evaluation.

1. The TRAN*STAR hardware is reliable. No equipment failures were observed during the evaluation which lasted for two months on a two-shift 5-day basis.

2. The position fixes taken at NSTL during May and June had a standard deviation of between 2 and 3 kilometers. The longitude standard deviation is larger than that for the latitude.
3. The fiducial time delay which is caused by the equipment and is corrected in the computer program should be changed from 75 to approximately 350 milliseconds to agree with the hardware. The tolerance on this time delay should be held to ± 10 percent (± 35 milliseconds) to hold this error to ± 0.2 km. This can be accomplished in the hardware and/or software.
4. The average time between fixes was approximately 3.2 hours and between good fixes was 4.6 hours. With an automated production system and the receiver located in the vicinity of NSTL the average time between good fixes should be between 3-4 hours.
5. The TRAN*STAR II system in its present form is adequate for R&D evaluation but is not an operational system. In addition to integrating the receiver with DCPRS, the data transmission capabilities of the NOVA-840 should be utilized to receive the orbital parameters and the observational data directly or else the receiver at NSTL should be modified to receive the twice daily orbital parameter updates from the satellites. A data base should be established on the NOVA 840 for the orbital parameters and the observational data. An additional data base to store position fixes and to provide data to be utilized for calculating estimated buoy position for drifting buoys is also required. The MATCH subroutine should be modified to handle more cases and checked out with actual data. These changes are considered to be routine in making a system operational.